

Remarks

Claims 10-17 are pending in the Application.

Claims 10 and 14 are rejected.

Claims 11-13 and 15-17 are objected to.

Claim 10 is cancelled herein without prejudice.

Claims 18-30 are added herein.

I. OBJECTED TO CLAIMS

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 11-13 and 15-17 are objected to. Office Action, at 3. The Examiner has objected to these claims in that they are dependent claims that depend (directly or indirectly) from rejected independent claims. *Id.*

Applicant has re-drafted Claim 11 in independent form and incorporated into new Claim 11 all the elements of Claim 10 except for the language “means for suspending said pair of elastic cords.” Since Claim 11 recites the structure for performing such suspension of the pair of elastic cords, Applicant has elected not to invoke § 112, ¶ 6, for this claim.

Applicant further notes that it has further amended Claim 11 for proper antecedent bases, including changing “driver” to --given golf club-- to avoid any ambiguity within the claim. Applicant has also amended the claims in outline format (*i.e.* elements (a), (b) and sub elements (i), (ii), etc.)) again to avoid any ambiguity within the claim. Applicant has also revised Claim 11 to remove the “aft spreader member” limitation from this claim, which limitation is now recited in new claim 18, which depends from Claim 1. And, Applicant has amended Claim 11 such that the elastic cords are now suspended in tension. Support for this limitation is found, for example, in Paragraph [0006] of the Application.

As to Claims 12-17, these each depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 11. Similarly, Applicant has corrected antecedent bases and included outline format to avoid any ambiguities. Moreover, Applicant has amended Claim 16 to reflect that Applicant

has elected not to invoke § 112, ¶ 6, for this claim.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his objections to Claims 11-13 and 15-17.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER *STUNDEN* IN VIEW OF *STONE*

Examiner has rejected Claims 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 389,336, issued to Stunden (“*Stunden*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,261,469, issued to Stone (“*Stone*”). Office Action, at 2.

Claim 10 has been cancelled herein without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of this claim is now moot.

As for Claim 14, this claim now depends from Claim 11, which has now been written in independent form and amended as described in Section I above. Hence, as Claim 11 is no longer in objected to form, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 14, which depends from Claim is also in condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Stunden* in view of *Stone*.

III. NEW CLAIMS

Applicant have amended the claims to add new Claims 18-30. No new matter has been added by these new claims.

IV. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicant that the Claims in the Application are now in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests allowance of such Claims.


45919-P001US

PATENT

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call Applicant's attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 
Ross Spencer Garsson
Reg. No. 38,150

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201
(512) 370-2870